arXiv:1207.6754v1 [math.DG] 29 Jul 2012

NON-BRANCHING GEODESICS AND OPTIMAL MAPS IN STRONG $CD(K, \infty)$-SPACES

TAPIO RAJALA AND KARL-THEODOR STURM

Abstract. We prove that in metric measure spaces where the entropy functional is K-convex along every Wasserstein geodesic any optimal transport between two absolutely continuous measures with finite second moments lives on a non-branching set of geodesics. As a corollary we obtain that in these spaces there exists only one optimal transport plan between any two absolutely continuous measures with finite second moments and this plan is given by a map.

The results are applicable in metric measure spaces having Riemannian Ricci-curvature bounded below, and in particular they hold also for Gromov-Hausdorff limits of Riemannian manifolds with Ricci-curvature bounded from below by some constant.

1. Introduction

Ricci-curvature lower-bounds in general metric measure spaces were studied by the second author in [13, 14] and at the same time with a similar approach by Lott and Villani in [9]. There the lower-bound $K \in \mathbb{R}$ on the Ricci curvature without a reference to the dimension of the metric measure space was defined as K-convexity of the entropy functional along Wasserstein geodesics (see Section 2 for details). These spaces are called (weak) $CD(K, \infty)$-spaces. The word *weak* is sometimes used to emphasize that the convexity is required only along one geodesic between any two given probability measures.

A property of the $CD(K, \infty)$-spaces which complicates the theory is the possibility to have branching geodesics. For example the space $\mathbb{R}^2$ with the l_∞-norm is a $CD(0, \infty)$-space and it has lots of branching geodesics. Being the limit as $p \to \infty$ (in any reasonable sense) of the spaces $\mathbb{R}^2$ with the l_p-norm – which are non-branching $\mathrm{CD}(K, \infty)$-spaces – this example in particular illustrates that being non-branching is not a stable property. A number of results in $CD(K, \infty)$-spaces have been proven only under the extra assumption that there are no branching geodesics in the space. Although in some of the results this assumption has recently been removed (see for example [12, 11]) in many it still remains.

Because branching geodesics are hard to deal with, it is reasonable to consider more restrictive definitions that exclude spaces with branching geodesics or at least limit the amount of branching that can occur. One of the essential properties of the definitions of Ricci-curvature lower-bounds in metric measure spaces is the stability under the measured Gromov-Hausdorff convergence. Therefore any stable definition that extends the Riemannian case should include the limit spaces of Riemannian manifolds with uniform Ricci-curvature lower-bounds. While Riemannian manifolds are known to be non-branching, to our knowledge it is not known

---

Date: July 31, 2012.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 53C23. Secondary 28A33, 49Q20.

Key words and phrases. Ricci curvature, metric measure spaces, branching geodesics.

T.R. acknowledges the support of the European Project ERC AdG *GeMeThNES* and the Academy of Finland project no. 137528.

whether this holds for their limit spaces. The spaces we consider in this note cover also these limit spaces. Although our result does not rule out the possibility to have some branching geodesics, it still says that there has to be so few branching geodesics that optimal transports between any two absolutely continuous measures do not see them. Let us now state our main result. We refer to Section 2 for the notation we use here.

Theorem 1.1. *Let* (X, d) *be a complete separable metric measure space with a locally finite measure* $\mathfrak{m}$. *Let* $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathrm{OptGeo}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ *with* $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathscr{P}_2(X)$ *absolutely continuous. Suppose that for every* $t, s \in [0,1]$ *and any Borel function* $f\colon \mathrm{Geo}(X) \to [0, \infty)$ *with* $\int_{\mathrm{Geo}(X)} f \,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\pi} = 1$ *the entropy* $\mathrm{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ *is* K*-convex along* $(\mathrm{restr}_{\mathrm{s}}^{\mathrm{t}})_{\#}(f\boldsymbol{\pi})$. *Then* $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ *is concentrated on a set of non-branching geodesics.*

As an immediate corollary of Theorem 1.1 we have the following result.

Corollary 1.2. *Let* (X, d) *be a complete separable metric measure space with a locally finite measure* $\mathfrak{m}$ *where* $\mathrm{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ *is* K*-convex along every* $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathrm{OptGeo}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ *for every* $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathscr{P}_2(X)$. *Then for every* $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathscr{P}_2(X)$ *which are absolutely continuous with respect to* $\mathfrak{m}$ *we have that any* $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathrm{OptGeo}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ *is concentrated on a set of non-branching geodesics.*

One of the cases which is covered by Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2 are the $RCD(K, \infty)$-spaces, that is, spaces with Riemannian Ricci-curvature bounded from below by some constant $K \in \mathbb{R}$. These spaces were recently defined and studied in [2, 3], see also [1]. They were obtained by reinforcing the $CD(K, \infty)$-spaces with a requirement that the local structure of the space must be Hilbertian. The Hilbertian structure immediately rules out spaces like the above mentioned $\mathbb{R}^2$ with the l_∞-norm. In [3] it was shown that one of the equivalent formulations of $RCD(K, \infty)$-spaces is that any probability measure with finite second moment is the starting point of an EVI_K-gradient flow of the entropy. This condition is known to imply K-convexity of the entropy along every geodesic [7].

In [3] it was also proven that the definition of $RCD(K, \infty)$ is stable under the measured Gromov-Hausdorff convergence (or under the $\mathbb{D}$-convergence introduced in [13]). When we combine this result with Theorem 1.1 we arrive at the following corollary which in fact was our main motivation to write this note.

Corollary 1.3. *The* $RCD(K, \infty)$*-spaces provide a stable abstract notion of non-branching spaces with Ricci-curvature bounded from below.*

Here the amount of non-branching is measured as before: Let $(X, \mathsf{d}, \mathfrak{m})$ *be an* $RCD(K, \infty)$*-space in the sense of* [3] *or* [1]. *Then for every* $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathscr{P}_2(X)$ *which are absolutely continuous with respect to* $\mathfrak{m}$ *we have that any* $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathrm{OptGeo}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ *is concentrated on a set of non-branching geodesics.*

As we already mentioned, we are not aware of any other non-branching results even for the Gromov-Hausdorff limits of Riemannian manifolds with Ricci-curvature bounded from below by some constant.

We also note that the conclusion of Corollary 1.2 can be stated in a stronger looking equivalent form. Namely, the measure $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ lives on a set of geodesics where no two distinct geodesics meet at some time $t \in (0, 1)$. To see this, consider a set of geodesics where there is such crossing. By mixing the geodesics before and after the crossing we produce a set of branching geodesics without affecting the initial and final measures. A contradiction follows then via Theorem 1.1.

By inspecting the proof of [8, Theorem 3.3] where the existence of optimal maps in non-branching $CD(K,\infty)$-spaces was shown we can make another refinement of the statement of Corollary 1.2. Regarding this refinement, stated in Corollary 1.4, we note that in [8] there was an extra assumption for the measures μ_0 and μ_1 to have finite entropy. This assumption was needed for showing that all absolutely continuous measures with respect to a measure $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathrm{OptGeo}(\mu_0,\mu_1)$ satisfying (2.1) also satisfy (2.1). Here this conclusion is already as an assumption so finiteness of the initial and final entropies are not needed.

Corollary 1.4. *Let (X,d) be a complete separable geodesic metric measure space with a locally finite measure $\mathfrak{m}$ where $\mathrm{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is K-convex along every $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathrm{OptGeo}(\mu_0,\mu_1)$ for every $\mu_0,\mu_1 \in \mathscr{P}_2(X)$. Then for every $\mu_0,\mu_1 \in \mathscr{P}_2(X)$ which are absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathfrak{m}$ there is a unique $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathrm{OptGeo}(\mu_0,\mu_1)$ and it is induced by a map.*

In the classical situation of Euclidean spaces the existence of optimal transport maps was proven by Brenier in [6]. Since then there have been several generalizations of this result. Most relevant in the context of this note are the generalizations of McCann [10] for Riemannian manifolds, of Bertrand [5] for Alexandrov spaces, and the most recent resutls of Gigli [8] in non-branching $CD(K,N)$ and $CD(K,\infty)$-spaces and of Ambrosio and the first author [4] in strongly non-branching metric spaces. Notice that as in the approach by Gigli [8] our proof for the existence of optimal transport maps does not use Kantorovich potentials.

2. Preliminaries

We work in a complete separable metric space (X,d) equipped with a locally finite Borel measure $\mathfrak{m}$. We write the set of all the Borel probability measures on X as $\mathscr{P}(X)$. We denote by $\mathscr{P}_2(X)$ the subset of $\mathscr{P}(X)$ consisting of probability measures with finite second moments. We equip the space $\mathscr{P}_2(X)$ with the Wasserstein 2-distance which for any two measures $\mu_0,\mu_1 \in \mathscr{P}_2(X)$ is defined as

$$W_2(\mu_0,\mu_1) = \left(\inf\left\{\int_{X\times X} d(x,y)^2 \,\mathrm{d}\sigma(x,y)\right\}\right)^{1/2},$$

where the infimum is taken over all $\sigma \in \mathscr{P}_2(X\times X)$ with $\mu_0 = (\mathtt{p}^1)_\#\sigma$ and $\mu_1 = (\mathtt{p}^2)_\#\sigma$. Here, and later on, $\mathtt{p}^k$ denotes the projection to the k:th coordinate.

All the geodesics we consider in this note are constant speed geodesics parametrized by the unit interval $[0,1]$. We denote the set of all such geodesics in X by $\mathrm{Geo}(X)$, and for $\gamma \in \mathrm{Geo}(X)$ and $t \in [0,1]$ we use the abbreviation $\gamma_t = \gamma(t)$. The distance between $\gamma^1,\gamma^2 \in \mathrm{Geo}(X)$ is given by $\max\{\mathsf{d}(\gamma^1_t,\gamma^2_t) : 0 \le t \le 1\}$. We define for all $s,t \in [0,1]$ the restriction map $\mathrm{restr}_s^t \colon \mathrm{Geo}(X) \to \mathrm{Geo}(X) \colon \gamma \mapsto \gamma \circ f_s^t$ with $f_s^t \colon [0,1] \to [0,1] \colon x \mapsto (s-t)x + t$.

We call a set $\Gamma \subset \mathrm{Geo}(X)$ *non-branching* if for any $\gamma,\tilde\gamma \in \Gamma$ we have: if there exists $t_0 \in (0,1]$ such that $\gamma_s = \tilde\gamma_s$ for all $s \in [0,t_0]$, then $\gamma = \tilde\gamma$. A measure $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathscr{P}(\mathrm{Geo}(X))$ is said to be concentrated on a set of non-branching geodesics, if there exists a non-branching Borel set $\Gamma \subset \mathrm{Geo}(X)$ so that $\boldsymbol{\pi}(\Gamma) = 1$. The space consisting of all measures $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathscr{P}(\mathrm{Geo}(X))$ for which the mapping $t \mapsto (\mathrm{e}_t)_\#\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is a geodesic in $\mathscr{P}(X)$ from $\mu_0 = (\mathrm{e}_0)_\#\boldsymbol{\pi}$ to $\mu_1 = (\mathrm{e}_1)_\#\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is denoted by $\mathrm{OptGeo}(\mu_0,\mu_1)$. Here the evaluation map is defined as $\mathrm{e}_t \colon \mathrm{Geo}(X) \to X \colon \gamma \mapsto \gamma_t$.

The Ricci-curvature is defined using the entropy functional $\mathrm{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ which for an absolutely continuous measure $\mu = \rho\mathfrak{m} \in \mathscr{P}(X)$ is defined as

$$\mathrm{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\mu) = \int_X \rho\log\rho \,\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{m}.$$

For measures that have a singular part we define $\mathrm{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\mu) = \infty$.

Following the definition in [13] we call a metric measure space $(X, \mathsf{d}, \mathfrak{m})$ a (weak) $CD(K, \infty)$-space, with some $K \in \mathbb{R}$, provided that for any $\mu_0, \mu_1 \in \mathscr{P}_2(X)$ there exists a geodesic $(\mu_t) \in \mathrm{Geo}(\mathscr{P}_2(X))$ along which $\mathrm{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is K-convex, that is

$$\mathrm{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\mu_t) \le (1-t)\mathrm{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\mu_0) + t\mathrm{Ent}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\mu_1) - \frac{K}{2}t(1-t)W_2^2(\mu_0, \mu_1) \tag{2.1}$$

holds for all $t \in [0, 1]$. We say that a functional is K-convex along $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathrm{OptGeo}(\mu_0, \mu_1)$ if it is K-convex along the corresponding geodesic $(\mathrm{e}_t)_\#\boldsymbol{\pi}$. If the inequality (2.1) is required to hold for all geodesics $(\mu_t) \in \mathrm{Geo}(\mathscr{P}_2(X))$, the space is sometimes called a strong $CD(K, \infty)$-space. However, some authors use the term *strong* to refer to a slightly weaker notion.

3. Proof of Theorem 1.1

The idea of the proof is similar to the proof of [12, Theorem 4]. We prove the claim by contradiction. First we find two geodesics in the Wasserstein space which start as the same geodesic and then branch out to two completely disjoint ones. By comparing the two geodesics separately and on the other hand their sum as one geodesic, we notice that there will be an extra drop of $\log 2$ in the entropy during the time interval when the branching occurs. In order to arrive at a contradiction this branching has to happen in a small enough time interval.

Let us start the proof with a simple lemma. It allows us to select the two disjoint geodesics needed for the contradiction. The geodesics will be selected using a probability measure on the product space $\mathrm{Geo}(X) \times \mathrm{Geo}(X)$. Notice that the constant $1/5$ in the lemma is not sharp, however it is sufficient for our use.

Lemma 3.1. *Let (X, d) be a separable metric space. Then for any $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathscr{P}(X \times X)$ for which $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\{(x, x) : x \in X\}) = 0$ there exists $E \subset X$ so that $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(E \times (X \setminus E)) > 1/5$.*

Proof. We will first reduce the general case to the case where X is a finite set. Take $\epsilon > 0$. Because the diagonal $\{(x, x) : x \in X\}$ has zero $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$-measure, there exists $\delta > 0$ so that

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}\big(\{(x, y) \in X \times X : \mathsf{d}(x, y) < \delta\}\big) < \epsilon. \tag{3.1}$$

Partition the space X into a countable collection of Borel sets $(Q_i)_i$ with diameter at most $\delta/2$. Now there exists some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ so that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \left((\mathsf{p}^k)_\#\boldsymbol{\sigma}\right)(Q_i) > 1 - \epsilon, \quad \text{for } k = 1, 2. \tag{3.2}$$

Therefore, by combining (3.1) and (3.2) we have

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}\left(\bigcup_{1 \le i,j \le n, i \ne j} Q_i \times Q_j\right) \ge 1 - 3\epsilon$$

and so by forgetting a part of the space with arbitrarily small measure we may assume the space X to consist of n points.

The existence of the set E in the case where X consists of n points follows easily: There are a total number of $2^n - 2$ ways to select a non-empty set $E \subsetneq X$ and for any pair of points

(i,j) with $i \neq j$ there are 2^{n-2} sets $E \subset X$ with $i \in E$ and $j \notin E$. Since

$$\sum_{E \subset X} \boldsymbol{\sigma}\big(E \times (X \setminus E)\big) = 2^{n-2},$$

there has to be a set $E \subset X$ with

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}\big(E \times (X \setminus E)\big) \geq \frac{2^{n-2}}{2^n - 2} > \frac{1}{4}.$$

Taking $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small finishes the proof. $\square$

Now we are ready to continue with the proof of Theorem 1.1. The first reduction steps contain ideas which were used in the proofs of [8, Theorem 3.3] and [12, Theorem 4]. The rest of the proof is then close to that of [12, Theorem 4].

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Assume that the claim is not true and let

$$l = \sqrt{\frac{\log 2}{6|K| + 1}}. \tag{3.3}$$

Because the problem is local in nature, we may assume the measure $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ to be concentrated on geodesics living inside some ball $B(x, l/2) \subset X$ so that in particular the geodesics have lengths bounded from above by l.

From the assumption that $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ is not concentrated on a non-branching set of geodesics we know that there exists some $T \in (0,1)$ so that the measure $\boldsymbol{\pi}_\gamma$ is not a Dirac mass for a $(\mathrm{restr}_0^{\mathrm{T}})_\# \boldsymbol{\pi}$-positive set of curves $\gamma \in \mathrm{Geo}(X)$, where $\{\boldsymbol{\pi}_\gamma\} \subset \mathscr{P}(\mathrm{Geo}(X))$ is the disintegration of $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ with respect to $\mathrm{restr}_0^{\mathrm{T}}$.

Consider a measure $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in \mathscr{P}(\mathrm{Geo}(X) \times \mathrm{Geo}(X))$ obtained by integrating up the disintegrated measure $\boldsymbol{\pi}_\gamma$ as a product measure $\boldsymbol{\pi}_\gamma \times \boldsymbol{\pi}_\gamma$. That is, for any Borel measurable $f \colon \mathrm{Geo}(X) \times \mathrm{Geo}(X) \to [0, \infty]$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathrm{Geo}(X) \times \mathrm{Geo}(X)} f(\gamma^1, \gamma^2) \,\mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\gamma^1, \gamma^2) \\
&\quad = \int_{\mathrm{Geo}(X)} \int_{(\mathrm{restr}_0^{\mathrm{T}})^{-1}(\gamma) \times (\mathrm{restr}_0^{\mathrm{T}})^{-1}(\gamma)} f(\gamma^1, \gamma^2) \,\mathrm{d}(\boldsymbol{\pi}_\gamma \times \boldsymbol{\pi}_\gamma)(\gamma^1, \gamma^2) \,\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{restr}_0^{\mathrm{T}})_\# \boldsymbol{\pi}(\gamma).
\end{aligned}$$

There exists some $S \in (T, 1)$ so that

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}\big(\{(\gamma^1, \gamma^2) \in \mathrm{Geo}(X) \times \mathrm{Geo}(X) \,:\, \mathrm{restr}_0^{\mathrm{S}}(\gamma^1) \neq \mathrm{restr}_0^{\mathrm{S}}(\gamma^2)\}\big) > 0.$$

Restrict $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ to this set and to simplify the notation still denote by $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ this new measure, which we renormalize to be a probability measure.

Furthermore, there exists a $\delta \in (0, (1-S)/2)$ so that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma\big(\{(\gamma^1, \gamma^2) \,:\, &\text{there exists } t \in [T, S] \text{ such that } \mathrm{restr}_0^{\mathrm{t}}(\gamma^1) = \mathrm{restr}_0^{\mathrm{t}}(\gamma^2) \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad \text{and } \gamma_s^1 \neq \gamma_s^2 \text{ for all } s \in (t, t+\delta)\}\big) > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Again we restrict $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ to this set and renormalize it to be a probability measure. Without loss of generality we may assume that there exists a constant $C > 0$ so that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{e}_0)\#(\mathtt{p}^1\boldsymbol{\sigma})}{\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{m}}, \frac{\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{e}_1)\#(\mathtt{p}^1\boldsymbol{\sigma})}{\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{m}}, \frac{\mathrm{d}(\mathrm{e}_1)\#(\mathtt{p}^2\boldsymbol{\sigma})}{\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{m}} < C.$$

Define the function $f\colon [0,1] \to [0,1]$ as

$$f(t) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}\big(\{(\gamma^1, \gamma^2) \,:\, \mathrm{restr}_0^{\mathrm{t}}\gamma^1 = \mathrm{restr}_0^{\mathrm{t}}\gamma^2\}\big).$$

Notice that f is decreasing, $f = 1$ on $[0, T]$ and $f = 0$ on $[S, 1]$. Roughly speaking $f(t)$ gives the amount of branching that will occur after time t.

Take a small $\epsilon \in (0, \delta)$ and let $t \in [T, S]$ be such that $f(t) - f(t + \epsilon) > \epsilon$. Define

$$F = \big\{(\gamma^1, \gamma^2) \,:\, \mathrm{restr}_0^{\mathrm{t}}\gamma^1 = \mathrm{restr}_0^{\mathrm{t}}\gamma^2 \text{ and } \mathrm{restr}_0^{\mathrm{t+\epsilon}}\gamma^1 \neq \mathrm{restr}_0^{\mathrm{t+\epsilon}}\gamma^2\big\}.$$

Now $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(F) > \epsilon$ by the choice of t. By Lemma 3.1 there exists $E \subset \mathrm{Geo}(X)$ so that

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}\Big(\big(E \times (\mathrm{Geo}(X) \setminus E)\big) \cap F\Big) > \frac{\boldsymbol{\sigma}(F)}{5} > \frac{\epsilon}{5}.$$

Let $\eta > 0$ be such that

$$M := \boldsymbol{\sigma}(A) > \frac{\boldsymbol{\sigma}\Big(\big(E \times (\mathrm{Geo}(X) \setminus E)\big) \cap F\Big)}{2} > \frac{\epsilon}{10}, \tag{3.4}$$

where $A = \big\{(\gamma^1, \gamma^2) \in \big(E \times (\mathrm{Geo}(X) \setminus E)\big) \cap F \,:\, \mathsf{d}(\gamma^1_{t+\epsilon}, \gamma^2_{t+\epsilon}) > \eta\big\}$.

Now define $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} = \boldsymbol{\sigma}|_A$ and using it $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}} = (\mathtt{p}^1)_\#\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$. Write $\tilde{\rho}_s\mathfrak{m} = (\mathrm{e}_s)_\#\tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}$ for all $s \in [0, 1]$. By Jensen's inequality and (3.4) we get

$$\int \tilde{\rho}_{t+\epsilon} \log \tilde{\rho}_{t+\epsilon} \,\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{m} \geq M \log \frac{M}{\mathfrak{m}(B(x, l/2))} \geq M \log \frac{\epsilon}{10\mathfrak{m}\big(B(x, l/2)\big)}. \tag{3.5}$$

Using (3.5) we find a set $Q \subset X$ with $\mathrm{diam}(Q) < \eta$ so that

$$w := \tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}(G) > 0$$

for $G = \{\gamma \in \mathrm{Geo}(X) \,:\, \gamma_{t+\epsilon} \in Q\}$ and

$$\int \rho^{\mathrm{up}}_{t+\epsilon} \log \rho^{\mathrm{up}}_{t+\epsilon} \,\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{m} \geq w \log \frac{\epsilon}{10\mathfrak{m}\big(B(x, l/2)\big)}, \tag{3.6}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{\mathrm{up}} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\pi}}|_G = (\mathtt{p}^1)_\#\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}|_{G\times\mathrm{Geo}(X)}$ and $\mu_s^{\mathrm{up}} = \rho_s^{\mathrm{up}}\mathfrak{m} = (\mathrm{e}_s)_\#\boldsymbol{\pi}^{\mathrm{up}}$ for all $s \in [0, 1]$. Define also $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{\mathrm{down}} = (\mathtt{p}^2)_\#\tilde{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}|_{G\times\mathrm{Geo}(X)}$ and $\mu_s^{\mathrm{down}} = \rho_s^{\mathrm{down}}\mathfrak{m} = (\mathrm{e}_s)_\#\boldsymbol{\pi}^{\mathrm{down}}$ for all $s \in [0, 1]$. Notice that $(\mathrm{restr}_0^{\mathrm{t}})_\#\boldsymbol{\pi}^{\mathrm{up}} = (\mathrm{restr}_0^{\mathrm{t}})_\#\boldsymbol{\pi}^{\mathrm{down}}$ and $\mu^{\mathrm{up}}_{t+\epsilon} \perp \mu^{\mathrm{down}}_{t+\epsilon}$.

Since we have not done any rescaling after defining the final $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ we notice that the estimate

$$\int \rho \log \rho \,\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{m} \leq w \log C \tag{3.7}$$

holds for all $\rho \in \{\rho_0^{\mathrm{down}} = \rho_0^{\mathrm{up}}, \rho_1^{\mathrm{down}}, \rho_1^{\mathrm{up}}\}$.

Now, similarly as in [12] we can estimate using the K-convexity first along the measure $(\boldsymbol{\pi}^{\mathrm{up}} + \boldsymbol{\pi}^{\mathrm{down}})/(2w)$ between times 0, t and $t + \epsilon$, and then separately along $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{\mathrm{up}}/w$ and

$\boldsymbol{\pi}^{\mathrm{down}}/w$ between times t, $t+\epsilon$ and 1 to get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \frac{\rho_t^{\mathrm{down}}}{w}\log\frac{\rho_t^{\mathrm{down}}}{w}\,\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{m}\\
&\le \frac{\epsilon}{t+\epsilon}\int \frac{\rho_0^{\mathrm{down}}}{w}\log\frac{\rho_0^{\mathrm{down}}}{w}\,\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{m} + \frac{t}{t+\epsilon}\int \frac{\rho_{t+\epsilon}^{\mathrm{down}}+\rho_{t+\epsilon}^{\mathrm{up}}}{2w}\log\frac{\rho_{t+\epsilon}^{\mathrm{down}}+\rho_{t+\epsilon}^{\mathrm{up}}}{2w}\,\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{m} + \frac{|K|}{2}tl^2\\
&\le \frac{\epsilon}{t+\epsilon}\log\frac{C}{w} - \frac{t}{t+\epsilon}\log 2\\
&\quad + \frac{t}{2(t+\epsilon)}\left(\int \frac{\rho_{t+\epsilon}^{\mathrm{down}}}{w}\log\frac{\rho_{t+\epsilon}^{\mathrm{down}}}{w}\,\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{m} + \int \frac{\rho_{t+\epsilon}^{\mathrm{up}}}{w}\log\frac{\rho_{t+\epsilon}^{\mathrm{up}}}{w}\,\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{m}\right) + \frac{|K|}{2}tl^2\\
&\le \frac{\epsilon}{t+\epsilon}\log\frac{C}{w} - \frac{t}{t+\epsilon}\log 2\\
&\quad + \frac{t}{2(t+\epsilon)}\left(\frac{\epsilon}{1-t}\int \frac{\rho_1^{\mathrm{down}}}{w}\log\frac{\rho_1^{\mathrm{down}}}{w}\,\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{m} + \frac{1-t-\epsilon}{1-t}\int \frac{\rho_t^{\mathrm{down}}}{w}\log\frac{\rho_t^{\mathrm{down}}}{w}\,\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{m}\right)\\
&\quad + \frac{t}{2(t+\epsilon)}\left(\frac{\epsilon}{1-t}\int \frac{\rho_1^{\mathrm{up}}}{w}\log\frac{\rho_1^{\mathrm{up}}}{w}\,\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{m} + \frac{1-t-\epsilon}{1-t}\int \frac{\rho_t^{\mathrm{up}}}{w}\log\frac{\rho_t^{\mathrm{up}}}{w}\,\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{m}\right) + |K|tl^2\\
&\le \left(\frac{\epsilon}{t+\epsilon} + \frac{t\epsilon}{(1-t)(t+\epsilon)}\right)\log\frac{C}{w} - \frac{t}{t+\epsilon}\log 2\\
&\quad + \frac{t(1-t-\epsilon)}{(t+\epsilon)(1-t)}\int \frac{\rho_t^{\mathrm{down}}}{w}\log\frac{\rho_t^{\mathrm{down}}}{w}\,\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{m} + |K|tl^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Moving the integral term from the right-hand side to the left and using (3.3) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\epsilon}{(t+\epsilon)(1-t)}\int \frac{\rho_t^{\mathrm{down}}}{w}\log\frac{\rho_t^{\mathrm{down}}}{w}\,\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{m} &\le \left(\frac{\epsilon}{t+\epsilon} + \frac{t\epsilon}{(1-t)(t+\epsilon)}\right)\log\frac{C}{w} - \frac{t}{t+\epsilon}\log 2 + |K|tl^2\\
&\le \left(\frac{\epsilon}{t+\epsilon} + \frac{t\epsilon}{(1-t)(t+\epsilon)}\right)\log\frac{C}{w} - \frac{2t}{3(t+\epsilon)}\log 2
\end{aligned}$$

which is the same as

$$\int \frac{\rho_t^{\mathrm{down}}}{w}\log\frac{\rho_t^{\mathrm{down}}}{w}\,\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{m} \le \log\frac{C}{w} - \frac{2t(1-t)}{3\epsilon}\log 2. \tag{3.8}$$

Using convexity along $\boldsymbol{\pi}^{\mathrm{up}}/w$ once more together with (3.8) and (3.3) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\int \frac{\rho_{t+\epsilon}^{\mathrm{up}}}{w}\log\frac{\rho_{t+\epsilon}^{\mathrm{up}}}{w}\,\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{m} &\le \frac{\epsilon}{1-t}\log\frac{C}{w} + \frac{1-t-\epsilon}{1-t}\int \frac{\rho_t^{\mathrm{down}}}{w}\log\frac{\rho_t^{\mathrm{down}}}{w}\,\mathrm{d}\mathfrak{m} + \frac{|K|}{2}\epsilon(1-t-\epsilon)l^2\\
&\le \log\frac{C}{w} - \frac{t(1-t-\epsilon)}{3\epsilon}\log 2.
\end{aligned}$$

When we combine this with (3.6) we have

$$3\epsilon\left(\log\frac{\epsilon}{10\mathfrak{m}\big(B(x,l/2)\big)} - \log C\right) \le -t(1-t-\epsilon)\log 2 \le -\frac{TS}{2}\log 2$$

which is a contradiction as the left-hand side goes to 0 when $\epsilon \downarrow 0$. □

References

[1] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, A. Mondino and T. Rajala, *Riemannian Ricci curvature lower bounds in metric measure spaces with σ-finite measure*, preprint, arXiv:1207.4924, (2012).

[2] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli and G. Savaré, *Calculus and heat flows in metric measure spaces with Ricci curvature bounded from below*, preprint, arXiv:1106.2090, (2011).

[3] L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli and G. Savaré, *Metric measure spaces with Riemannian Ricci curvature bounded from below*, preprint, arXiv:1109.0222, (2011).

[4] L. Ambrosio and T. Rajala, *Slopes of Kantorovich potentials and existence of optimal transport maps in metric measure spaces*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl., to appear.

[5] J. Bertrand, *Existence and uniqueness of optimal maps on Alexandrov spaces*, Adv. Math., **219** (2008), no. 3, 838–851.

[6] Y. Brenier, *Décomposition polaire et réarrangement monotone des champs de vecteurs*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math., **305** (1987), 805–808.

[7] S. Daneri and G. Savaré, *Eulerian calculus for the displacement convexity in the Wasserstein distance*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **40** (2008), no. 3, 1104–1122.

[8] N. Gigli, *Optimal maps in non branching spaces with Ricci curvature bounded from below*, Geom. Funct. Anal., to appear.

[9] J. Lott and C. Villani, *Ricci curvature for metric-measure spaces via optimal transport*, Ann. of Math. **169** (2009), no. 3, 903–991.

[10] R. J. McCann, *Polar factorization of maps on riemannian manifolds*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **11** (2001), 589–608.

[11] T. Rajala, *Interpolated measures with bounded density in metric spaces satisfying the curvature-dimension conditions of Sturm*, J. Funct. Anal., **263** (2012), no. 4, 896–924.

[12] T. Rajala, *Local Poincaré inequalities from stable curvature conditions on metric spaces*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations, **44** (2012), no. 3–4, 477–494.

[13] K.-T. Sturm, *On the geometry of metric measure spaces. I*, Acta Math. **196** (2006), no. 1, 65–131.

[14] K.-T. Sturm, *On the geometry of metric measure spaces. II*, Acta Math. **196** (2006), no. 1, 133–177.

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, P.O. Box 35 (MaD), FI-40014 University of Jyväskylä, Finland
E-mail address: `tapio.m.rajala@jyu.fi`

Institut für Angewandte Mathematik, Universität Bonn, Endenicher Allee 60, D-53115 Bonn, Germany
E-mail address: `sturm@uni-bonn.de`